Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting
Date: February 3, 2000   **Time:** 10:00 a.m.
Location: Lewis Cass Bldg., 1st Floor, Dept. of Management and Budget Large Conference Room

I.   Approval of January Meeting Minutes

II. Geographic Framework Program
        A. Michigan Information Center (MIC) Project Update
                1. Phase 2 Status
    Rob Surber, MIC, distributed a current framework status map. The Phase 2 work for Berrien
County has been completed. Baraga and Keweenaw Counties have been fully seamed. The goal
is to seam data on all county lines and attribute geography to the Upper Peninsula first, then will
have an entire MDOT region done. Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) will use
this data in their regional office. Muskegon County has reached identity point. Kent and
Saginaw Counties will soon be through Phase 2.
    Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if MIC has any interest in getting Gogebic and Delta Counties
without functional class changes.
    Everett Root, MIC, responded that MIC could add the data themselves. That will help keep
things moving.
    Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that MDOT just got Ontonagon County and will make it
top priority.
    Rob Surber, MIC, reported that all Upper Peninsula counties have had work done on them.
The Ontonagan and Gogebic county line is the only one that hasn't had work done. Even though
all county boundaries are not fully seamed, a lot work has been done. The MIC is working on
seaming for Cheboygan and Presque Isle. The MIC is beginning with the upper northeast corner
of the Lower Peninsula.
    Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if MIC wants Presque Isle County also.
    Everett Root, MIC, responded that the MIC could wait for Presque Isle County - will advise
MDOT when they are ready for it.
    Gil Chesbro, MDOT, asked if MIC found anything unusual while seaming.
    Rob Surber, MIC, commented that in the mile point reconciliation between counties have
been problematic, but can be overcome. They have been posted differently historically.
Therefore, MIC must be logical and consistent with the reconciliation. MIC is now running
checks and quality controls.
                2. Repositioning
    Everett Root, MIC, reported that repositioning has been started with Monroe County because
there is full digital ortho coverage for the county. It also provides a little of everything the MIC
expects to encounter while repositioning – shoreline, urban, rural, interstate highways. Alden
Leatherman, MIC, created menus and programs so that when a feature (node or arc) is moved or
a vertex is deleted, added, or moved, the arc will automatically 6 different attributes. The
repositioning source, the referencing method used, the date the feature was edited, and the date
the source was created.
    Gil Chesbro, MDOT, asked what the MIC has noticed the relationship of the current
framework in respect to the work they are doing.
    Everett Root, MIC, stated that they would probably have to move every node in the state. In
the rural area, the roads are pretty straight, so basically they move the roads, select the arc,
generalize and the vertices go away. Will have to check with people about how to handle some

of the hydrologic features. It is often difficult to determine what to interpret where drains and streams are can be problematic.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the Monroe County shoreline is the most difficult shoreline in the state.

Everett Root, MIC, commented that his initial impression is to leave the shoreline alone, make sure that all the roads are within the shoreline, and wait for newer imagery – this is 1992 imagery and shoreline has changed considerably.

Rob Surber, MIC, commented that this is a topic that will be discussed later in the meeting during Base Map Scale Versions. The MIC would be documenting decisions as they are made. That is the purpose of a pilot, to be shot down by the experts during review and comment. There will be more to come on that. At next meeting, will show this work on a plot at next meeting.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked if during repositioning if they encountered any corrections topologically.

Everett Root, MIC, responded that he found one, but didn't make the correction because he is waiting to decide if they are going to make that type of change. There are a couple of things that need to be decided on.

    3. Cabinet Meeting Presentation

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC would be making a presentation to the Governor's cabinet February 14. The December meeting was cancelled and January didn't work out. They will present the application showing state agencies' data integrated with Bill Enslin's, MSU Center for Remote Sensing, viewing tool.

  B. Base Map Scale Versions

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the technical group will meet Thursday, the week of February 14th, to look at county line and shoreline versions of the base map of different scales and how to share information. The goal is to have set named versions of the data. They will look at how to set standards, current versions, who is using different versions, where they came from, and Metadata. They will start with a small-scale versions first and then work into 1:24,000. If interested in attending, contact Rob Surber, MIC, (517) 373-7910 or surberr@state.mi.us for details.

III. Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)

 Not present.

IV. Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Projects and Activities

Gil Chesbro, MDOT, reported that an enabled web site has been released internally within the department. They plan to eventually make it public. This is the first of a half dozen applications to be released this year.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that they are still working on counties to deliver to MIC. They are still pursuing the Highway Pavement Management System (HPMS) segmentation issue.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the HPMS is another important data set (federal funding) that could be merged into the framework.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that they are trying to make sure they have equivalence between HPMS id and the framework. The framework will be source for collecting new data in the future. They also have to group their HPMS data by different classifications. If they change the segmentation because they went to framework, it would complicate things.

VI. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Project and Activities

John Clark, MDEQ, reported that they got a final grant approval to do Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) system mapping on the Macatawa River Watershed and Boardman River

Watershed. LIDAR is a method of collecting high-resolution elevation model taken by laser flown low-flying aircraft. The intent is to map flood plains accurately. They are also having a training session the end of March. May be able to get an IKONOS imaging sample for Michigan. IKONOS is a satellite collecting 1-meter resolution. This may put twist on digital ortho quarter quads (DOQQs). MDEQ has online Internet mapping for a pilot project for the Well Key database along with framework information. MDEQ has its own GIS serving equipment and are beginning to set up data on it. Hope to rethink the way they store data and make it available by setting up a database that catalogs each GIS layer. They are interested in the information that the MIC has collected. Mike Beaulac was hired as it the manager of the Surface Water Quality Division. Spatial Data Engine (SDE) 8.0 interface is slow. SDE that came with ArcInfo 8.0 is an upgrade from the current SDE. When it has been installed, the will start with putting the web application into SDE and then add layers. SDE allows users to define what they want to see before it is loaded up.

VII.   MIC Projects and Activities
        A. Statewide Land Database Facility ID Standards
   Rob Surber, MIC, distributed current draft of the statewide land data base (SWLDB) ID standards and would appreciate feedback. It clearly follows the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) facilities id standard that was written to support the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) facilities tracking. It has been expanded and is very generic. It focuses mainly on location information. It is being written to provide easy integration at the state level. Many agencies collect data on facilities from different angles and the goal is to coordinate as much as possible with the state's spatial data warehouse. Will be sending this through Department of Management and Budget to work with the different departments. Contact Rob Surber, MIC, if you have questions or comments. It is currently being designed for the 'fixed asset facilities', but can be expanded to regulated sites, etc.
        B. Underground Storage Tank Geocoding
   Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC entered into an agreement with MDEQ, Storage Tank Division, to map by address all underground storage tanks starting with the SEMCOG region. If possible, will use a batch mode and will work manually through SEMCOG first and then the Isabella/Baraga area. They will be working with the above ground storage tanks later in year. The mapping will be done with framework standards and will have Metadata associated with it. The goal is to have a lot done by the end of May and will continue until about September with the remaining work. There is an estimate of 13,000 tanks but the file has 38,000 - the exact number will have to be confirmed. This will be a useful data set.
        C.   Michigan Employment Security Administration (MESA) Geocoding
   Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC has been talking with Dick Nellet, MDOT, about geocoding the addresses of employers throughout the state. The issue is how do we as a state develop a program that works for everybody in terms of mapping, coordinating geocoding of addresses, how they are recorded, accuracy, and version control that works for all. If framework is to be used, then we are interested in finding out about updates. There may be an update mechanism web interface to provide feedback and have a consistent product statewide that agencies can use. A meeting is scheduled with MDOT and many other interested parties to brainstorm. They will discuss a pilot that was done and its suitability. The regions can play an important role in this and all will benefit from this application.
   Gil Chesbro, MDOT, commented that MDOT had worked on this before. It was a pretty tough nut to crack.
   Rob Surber, MIC, responded that they are going to try again and framework may be important as a way to center around the base map application.

D. Census 2000 Hard-To-Enumerate Area Maps

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC has been mapping hard-to-enumerate areas. The census is coming up April 1,2000. These maps use census data that the U.S. Bureau of the Census generated that shows historically where areas of potential undercount of population may be. It is based on linguistic isolation, mobility, vacancy rates, renter versus owners, poverty rate, etc. In addition to that, MIC has linked from the Qualified Voter File (QVF) rural delivery addresses. This is a potential hard-to-enumerate area because mailings are not sent to rural delivery areas – door-to-door interviews are done. A map displaying the Detroit hard-to-enumerate area was displayed. This is a political issue, legislators want to make sure that they get the word out in their areas and Local Complete County Committees (which are usually run by local officials) around the state are interested in these maps. The Census 2000 Conference is scheduled for February 9 and 10. Information and registration is available on the MIC web site.

VIII. Regional Projects and Activities

Tammi Shepherd, SEMCOG, reported that SEMCOG is still working on Livingston County blocks and should be done in about 1 week. Has been talk with Jason McKinley, Plante Moran, to get the improved street names from the Trillium program that was run on the computer assisted design (CAD) files, the results will link to the Livingston County file and SEMCOG will review. Oakland County has different standards for street naming and it is hard to compare to Livingston County. The Trillium program, which are set to United States Postal Service (USPS) standards, results look good when scrolled through. The GIS Regional Coordination Committee has a conflict in their meeting date and the Michigan GIS Users' meeting for next month. The Standards Committee will be meeting on February 24. The Education Sub-Committee is meeting next week.

IX. MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU, reported that MSU finished the last county for lake and polygon building for the state. They need to complete by February 16 for the rollout to the county health departments, therefore had to move forward without Phase 2 framework data for 20 counties. 28 counties have different collateral data for enhancing the lake names - will work on this later. The ID issue is resolved – it was data transfer problem with ESRI products. At this time the edge matching has been to make sure lake names correspond across counties. Will be doing edge matching on the lakes between the counties themselves. Have to roll out data to the health departments on February 16. Now finalizing the process for creating and installing CDs – one for each county. The CDs will have the MIC framework; MIRIS data for airports, pipelines, utilities, and shoreline; United States Geological Survey (USGS) place names and digital topographic quads and a MDEQ layer (watersheds). More data will be added later. The data will be installed with the MSU map image viewer. MSU and Imagin sponsored a Land Cover/Use Update meeting. There will be a Imagin white paper on the land use process to encourage creation of standards. MSU is under a contact with Wexford County to do a Land Cover/Use update. They will be using NAP photography from 1998. There will be web site soon on that effort.

X. County/Local Projects and Activities

Not Present

XI. Federal Projects and Activities

Not Present

XII.   Other Issues
    Carol Woodman, Michigan State Industries (MSI), reported that they had a problem with some counties so there was a delay in delivery, but delivered Ontonagon, Sanilac, and Midland Counties today and will get Kalamazoo County tomorrow and Iosco County next week.

    Leelyn Johnson, Library of Michigan, commented that she would be attending the Census 2000 Conference.

    Eric Nischan, Michigan State Police (MSP), reported that he would be building a statewide GIS emergency management database on the framework. He has been instructed not to reinvent the wheel, but to use what has been done, so he will be calling people for information.

    John Clark, MDEQ, asked if the framework is freely distributed.
    Rob Surber, MIC, responded that it is readily distributeable but there is an issue regarding service after sale. Talk to the MIC before distributing it so that they can be prepared for any calls they might get.

    There was a discussion regarding ArcInfo 8. It was recommended not install 8 with 7.2 on the same machine. ESRI is sending out a patch on CD for those who received part of the first shipment. Talk to your rep to see if you need a patch or not. The ArcInfo Listserv compiles results and recommendations. SEMCOG is considering sponsoring a workshop – they will advise.

    Carol Woodman, MSI, asked if the is a way to keep the costs for the maintenance agreements for ESRI products down.

    Rob Surber, MIC, responded that there is a Blanket Purchase Order for the state and will work with Carol.

XIII.   Next Meeting Date
    March 9, 2000, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Lewis Cass Building, 1st Floor, North Wing, Department of Management & Budget Large Conference Room

** If any changes or corrections are to be made to these minutes, please contact the Michigan Information

Center at (517) 373-7910.